AIR QUALITY PERMIT

Issued To: Goose Bay Equipment, Inc.
1995 Third Ave. East
Kalispell, Montana 59901

Permit #3248-00
Complete Application Submitted: 03/12/03
Preliminary Determination Issued: 04/16/03
Department Decision Issued: 05/02/03
Permit Final: 05/20/03
AFS #777-3248

An air quality permit, with conditions, is hereby granted to Goose Bay Equipment, Inc. (Goose Bay), pursuant to Sections 75-2-204 and 211, Montana Code Annotated (MCA), as amended, and the Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM) 17.8.740, *et seq*., as amended, for the following:

Section I: Permitted Facilities

A. Plant Location: Goose Bay operates a portable crushing/screening operation that will originally locate in the SW¼ of the SE¼ of Section 3, Township 31 North, Range 19 West, in Flathead County, Montana. However, Permit #3248-00 applies while operating at any location in Montana, except within those areas having a Department of Environmental Quality (Department) approved permitting program. *A Missoula County air quality permit will be required for locations within Missoula County, Montana.* An addendum to this air quality permit will be required if Goose Bay intends to locate in or within 10 kilometers (km) of certain PM_{10} nonattainment areas.

B. Permitted Equipment

Goose Bay operates a portable crushing/screening operation. A complete list of the permitted equipment is contained in Section I.A of the permit analysis.

Section II: Limitations and Conditions

A. Operational Limitations and Conditions

1. Goose Bay shall not cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere any visible emissions that exhibit an opacity of 20% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes (ARM 17.8.304 and ARM 17.8.752).

2. Water and spray bars shall be available on site at all times and operated, as necessary, to maintain compliance with the opacity limitations in Section II.A.1 (ARM 17.8.749 and ARM 17.8.752).

3. Goose Bay shall not cause or authorize the use of any street, road, or parking lot without taking reasonable precautions to control emissions of airborne particulate matter (ARM 17.8.308 and ARM 17.8.752).

4. Goose Bay shall treat all unpaved portions of the haul roads, access roads, parking lots, or the general plant area with water and/or chemical dust suppressant as necessary to maintain compliance with the reasonable precautions limitation in Section II.A.3 (ARM 17.8.749 and ARM 17.8.752).

5. Total screen production from the one screen shall be limited to 1,752,000 tons during any rolling 12-month time period (ARM 17.8.749).

6. The diesel generator (up to 150 Kilowatts (kW) capacity) and the gasoline engine (up to 50 horsepower (HP) capacity) shall not individually exceed 8,540 hours of operation during any rolling 12-month time period (ARM 17.8.749).

7. If the permitted equipment is used in conjunction with any other equipment owned or operated by Goose Bay, at the same site, production shall be limited to correspond with an emission level that does not exceed 250 tons during any rolling 12-month time period. Any calculations used to establish production levels shall be approved by the Department (ARM 17.8.749).

B. Testing Requirements

1. All compliance source tests shall conform to the requirements of the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual (ARM 17.8.106).

2. The Department may require testing (ARM 17.8.105).

C. Operational Reporting Requirements

1. If the screening plant is moved to another location, an Intent to Transfer Form must be sent to the Department. In addition, a Public Notice Form for Change of Location must be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the area to which the transfer is to be made, at least 15 days prior to the move. The Intent to Transfer Form and the proof of publication (affidavit) of the Public Notice Form for Change of Location must be submitted to the Department prior to the move. These forms are available from the Department (ARM 17.8.765).

2. Goose Bay shall maintain on-site records showing daily hours of operation and daily production rates for the last 12 months. All records compiled in accordance with this permit shall be maintained by Goose Bay as a permanent business record for at least 5 years following the date of the measurement, shall be available at the plant site for inspection by the Department, and shall be submitted to the Department upon request (ARM 17.8.749).

3. Goose Bay shall supply the Department with annual production information for all emission points, as required by the Department in the annual emission inventory request. The request will include, but is not limited to, all sources of emissions identified in the most recent emission inventory report and sources identified in Section I.A of the permit analysis.

   Production information shall be gathered on a calendar-year basis and submitted to the Department by the date required in the emission inventory request. Information shall be in units, as required by the Department. This information may be used for calculating operating fees, based on actual emissions from the facility, and/or to verify compliance with permit limitations (ARM 17.8.505).

4. Goose Bay shall notify the Department of any construction or improvement project conducted, pursuant to ARM 17.8.745(1), that would include a change in control equipment, stack height, stack diameter, stack flow, stack gas temperature, source location, or fuel specifications, or would result in an increase in source capacity above its permitted operation or the addition of a new emission unit.

The notice must be submitted to the Department, in writing, 10 days prior to start-up or use of the proposed de minimis change, or as soon as reasonably practicable in the event of an unanticipated circumstance causing the de minimis change, and must include the information requested in ARM 17.8.745(1)(d)(ARM 17.8.745).

5. Goose Bay shall document, by month, the total screening production for the facility. By the 25th day of each month, Goose Bay shall total the screening production during the previous 12 months to verify compliance with the limitation in Section II.A.5. A written report of the compliance verification shall be submitted along with the annual emission inventory (ARM 17.8.749).

6. Goose Bay shall document, by month, the hours of operation of both the 150 kW diesel generator and the 50 HP gasoline engine. By the 25th day of each month, Goose Bay shall total the hours of operation of both the diesel generator and gasoline engine during the previous 12-months to verify compliance with the limitation in Section II.A.6. A written report of the compliance verification shall be submitted along with the annual emission inventory (ARM 17.8.749).

7. Goose Bay shall annually certify that its actual emissions are less than those that would require the source to obtain an air quality operating permit as required by ARM 17.8.1204(3)(b). The annual certification shall comply with the certification requirements of ARM 17.8.1207. The annual certification shall be submitted with the annual emissions inventory information (ARM 17.8.1204).

Section III: General Conditions

A. Inspection – Goose Bay shall allow the Department's representatives access to the source at all reasonable times for the purpose of making inspections or surveys, collecting samples, obtaining data, auditing any monitoring equipment (CEMS, CERMS) or observing any monitoring or testing, and otherwise conducting all necessary functions related to this permit.

B. Waiver - The permit and all the terms, conditions, and matters stated herein shall be deemed accepted if Goose Bay fails to appeal as indicated below.

C. Compliance with Statutes and Regulations - Nothing in this permit shall be construed as relieving Goose Bay of the responsibility for complying with any applicable federal or Montana statute, rule, or standard, except as specifically provided in ARM 17.8.740, *et seq*. (ARM 17.8.756).

D. Enforcement - Violations of limitations, conditions, and requirements contained herein may constitute grounds for permit revocation, penalties, or other enforcement as specified in Section 75-2-401, *et seq*., MCA.

E. Appeals - Any person or persons jointly or severally adversely affected by the Department's decision may request, within 15 days after the Department renders its decision, upon affidavit setting forth the grounds therefore, a hearing before the Board of Environmental Review (Board). A hearing shall be held under the provisions of the Montana Administrative Procedures Act. The filing of a request for a hearing postpones the effective date of the Department decision until the conclusion of the hearing and issuance of a final decision by the Board. The Department's decision on the application is not final unless 15 days have elapsed and there is no request for a hearing under this

section.

F. Permit Inspection - As required by ARM 17.8.755, Inspection of Permit, a copy of the air quality permit shall be made available for inspection by Department personnel at the location of the permitted source.

G. Construction Commencement - Construction must begin within 3 years of permit issuance and proceed with due diligence until the project is complete or the permit shall be revoked.

H. Permit Fees - Pursuant to Section 75-2-220, MCA, as amended by the 1991 Legislature, failure to pay by Goose Bay of an annual operation fee may be grounds for revocation of this permit, as required by that section and rules adopted thereunder by the Board.

I. The Department may modify the conditions of this permit based on local conditions of any future site. These factors may include, but are not limited to, local terrain, meteorological conditions, proximity to residences, etc.

J. Goose Bay shall comply with the conditions contained in this permit while operating at any location in Montana, except within those areas having a Department approved permitting program.

PERMIT ANALYSIS
Goose Bay Equipment, Inc.
Permit Number 3248-00

I. Introduction/Process Description

A. Permitted Equipment

On March 12, 2003, Goose Bay Equipment, Inc. (Goose Bay), submitted a complete permit application to operate a portable screening facility consisting of a portable 1986 Plains State 3-deck screen (maximum capacity up to 200 tons per hour (TPH)), a diesel generator (up to 150 kilowatts (kW)), a gasoline engine (up to 50 horsepower (HP)), and associated equipment. The original location for the facility will be in the SW¼ of the SE¼ of Section 3, Township 31 North, Range 19 West, in Flathead County, Montana. Permit #3248-00 will apply to the source while operating at any location in Montana, except within those areas having a Department of Environmental Quality (Department) approved permitting program. *A Missoula County air quality permit will be required for locations within Missoula County, Montana*. An addendum to this air quality permit will be required if Goose Bay intends to locate in or within 10 kilometers (km) of certain PM_{10} nonattainment areas.

B. Process Description

Goose Bay proposes to use this screening plant to sort sand and gravel materials for use in various construction operations. For a typical operational setup, unprocessed materials are loaded into a hopper and conveyed to the screening plant by a feed conveyor. The materials are then screened and conveyed to stockpile for use in various construction activities.

II. Applicable Rules and Regulations

The following are partial explanations of some applicable rules and regulations that apply to the facility. The complete rules are stated in the Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM) and are available, upon request, from the Department. Upon request, the Department will provide references for locations of complete copies of all applicable rules and regulations or copies where appropriate.

A. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 1 - General Provisions, including, but not limited to:

1. ARM 17.8.101 Definitions. This rule is a list of applicable definitions used in this chapter, unless indicated otherwise in a specific subchapter.

2. ARM 17.8.105 Testing Requirements. Any person or persons responsible for the emission of any air contaminant into the outdoor atmosphere shall, upon written request of the Department, provide the facilities and necessary equipment (including instruments and sensing devices) and shall conduct tests, emission or ambient, for such periods of time as may be necessary, using methods approved by the Department.

3. ARM 17.8.106 Source Testing Protocol. The requirements of this rule apply to any emission source testing conducted by the Department, any source, or other entity as required by any rule in this chapter, or any permit or order issued pursuant to this chapter, or the provisions of the Clean Air Act of Montana, 75-2-101, *et seq*., Montana Code Annotated (MCA).

Goose Bay shall comply with all requirements contained in the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual, including, but not limited to, using the proper test methods and supplying the required reports. A copy of the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual is available from the Department upon request.

4. ARM 17.8.110 Malfunctions. (2) The Department must be notified promptly by telephone whenever a malfunction occurs that can be expected to create emissions in excess of any applicable emission limitation or to continue for a period greater than 4 hours.

5. ARM 17.8.111 Circumvention. (1) No person shall cause or permit the installation or use of any device or any means which, without resulting in reduction in the total amount of air contaminant emitted, conceals or dilutes an emission of air contaminant that would otherwise violate an air pollution control regulation. (2) No equipment that may produce emissions shall be operated or maintained in such a manner that a public nuisance is created.

B. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 2 - Ambient Air Quality, including, but not limited to:

1. ARM 17.8.210 Ambient Air Quality Standards for Sulfur Dioxide
2. ARM 17.8.211 Ambient Air Quality Standards for Nitrogen Dioxide
3. ARM 17.8.212 Ambient Air Quality Standards for Carbon Monoxide
4. ARM 17.8.220 Ambient Air Quality Standard for Settled Particulate Matter
5. ARM 17.8.223 Ambient Air Quality Standard for PM_{10}

Goose Bay must comply with the applicable ambient air quality standards.

C. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 3 - Emission Standards, including, but not limited to:

1. ARM 17.8.304 Visible Air Contaminants. This rule requires that no person may cause or authorize emissions to be discharged into the outdoor atmosphere from any source installed after November 23, 1968, that exhibit an opacity of 20% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes.

2. ARM 17.8.308 Particulate Matter, Airborne. (1) This rule requires an opacity limitation of 20% for all fugitive emission sources and that reasonable precautions be taken to control emissions of airborne particulate matter. (2) Under this rule, Goose Bay shall not cause or authorize the use of any street, road, or parking lot without taking reasonable precautions to control emissions of airborne particulate matter.

3. ARM 17.8.309 Particulate Matter, Fuel Burning Equipment. This rule requires that no person shall cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere particulate matter caused by the combustion of fuel in excess of the amount determined by this rule.

4. ARM 17.8.310 Particulate Matter, Industrial Processes. This rule requires that no person shall cause or allow to be discharged into the atmosphere particulate matter in excess of the amount set forth in this rule.

5. ARM 17.8.322 Sulfur Oxide Emissions--Sulfur in Fuel. This rule requires that no person shall burn liquid, solid, or gaseous fuel in excess of the amount set forth in this rule.
6. ARM 17.8.324 Hydrocarbon Emissions--Petroleum Products. (3) No person

shall load or permit the loading of gasoline into any stationary tank with a capacity of 250 gallons or more from any tank truck or trailer, except through a permanent submerged fill pipe, unless such tank truck or trailer is equipped with a vapor loss control device as described in (1) of this rule.

7. ARM 17.8.340 Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources. This rule incorporates, by reference, 40 CFR 60, Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources (NSPS). The owner or operator of any stationary source or modification, as defined and applied in 40 CFR Part 60, NSPS, shall comply with the standards and provisions of 40 CFR Part 60.

   In order for a crushing/screening plant to be subject to NSPS requirements, two specific criteria must be met. First, the crushing/screening plant must meet the definition of an affected facility and, second, the equipment in question must have been constructed, reconstructed, or modified after August 31, 1983**.** Based on the information submitted by Goose Bay, at the time of issuance of Permit #3248-00, the screening equipment to be used under Permit #3248-00 does not meet the definition of an affected facility and is not subject to New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) requirements (40 CFR Part 60, Subpart A General Provisions, and Subpart OOO, Non-Metallic Mineral Processing Plants).

D. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 5 - Air Quality Permit Application, Operation, and Open Burning Fees, including, but not limited to:

1. ARM 17.8.504 Air Quality Permit Application Fees. This rule requires that Goose Bay submit an air quality permit application fee concurrent with the submittal of an air quality permit application. A permit application is incomplete until the proper application fee is paid to the Department. Goose Bay submitted the appropriate permit application fee as required for the current permit action.

2. ARM 17.8.505 Air Quality Operation Fees. An annual air quality operation fee must, as a condition of continued operation, be submitted to the Department by each source of air contaminants holding an air quality permit, excluding an open burning permit, issued by the Department. This operation fee is based on the actual or estimated actual amount of air pollutants emitted during the previous calendar year.

   An air quality operation fee is separate and distinct from an air quality permit application fee. The annual assessment and collection of the air quality operation fee, described above, shall take place on a calendar-year basis. The Department may insert into any final permit issued after the effective date of these rules, such conditions as may be necessary to require the payment of an air quality operation fee on a calendar-year basis, including provisions that pro-rate the required fee amount.

E. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 7 - Permit, Construction and Operation of Air Contaminant Sources, including, but not limited to:

1. ARM 17.8.740 Definitions. This rule is a list of applicable definitions used in this chapter, unless indicated otherwise in a specific subchapter.

2. ARM 17.8.743 Montana Air Quality Permits--When Required. This rule

requires a facility to obtain an air quality permit or permit alteration if they construct, alter, or use any asphalt plant, crusher, or screen that has the potential to emit greater than 15 tons per year of any pollutant. Goose Bay has the potential to emit more than 15 tons per year of total particulate matter (PM), particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 microns or less (PM_{10}), oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), and carbon monoxide (CO); therefore, an air quality permit is required.

3. ARM 17.8.744 Montana Air Quality Permits--General Exclusions. This rule identifies the activities that are not subject to the Montana Air Quality Permit program.

4. ARM 17.8.745 Montana Air Quality Permits—Exclusion for De Minimis Changes. This rule identifies the de minimis changes at permitted facilities that are not subject to the Montana Air Quality Permit Program.

5. ARM 17.8.748 New or Modified Emitting Units--Permit Application Requirements. This rule requires that a permit application be submitted prior to installation, alteration or use of a source. Goose Bay submitted the required permit application for the current permit action. (7) This rule requires that the applicant notify the public by means of legal publication in a newspaper of general circulation in the area affected by the application for a permit. Goose Bay submitted an affidavit of publication of public notice for the March 14, 2003, issues of the *Daily Inter Lake*, a newspaper of general circulation in the Town of Kalispell in Flathead County, as proof of compliance with the public notice requirements.

6. ARM 17.8.749 Conditions for Issuance or Denial of Permit. This rule requires that the permits issued by the Department must authorize the construction and operation of the facility or emitting unit subject to the conditions in the permit and the requirements of this subchapter. This rule also requires that the permit must contain any conditions necessary to assure compliance with the Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA), the Clean Air Act of Montana, and rules adopted under those acts.

7. ARM 17.8.752 Emission Control Requirements. This rule requires a source to install the maximum air pollution control capability that is technically practicable and economically feasible, except that BACT shall be utilized. The required BACT analysis is included in Section IV of this permit analysis.

8. ARM 17.8.755 Inspection of Permit. This rule requires that air quality permits shall be made available for inspection by the Department at the location of the source.

9. ARM 17.8.756 Compliance with Other Requirements. This rule states that nothing in the permit shall be construed as relieving Goose Bay of the responsibility for complying with any applicable federal or Montana statute, rule, or standard, except as specifically provided in ARM 17.8.740, *et seq*.

10. ARM 17.8.759 Review of Permit Applications. This rule describes the Department's responsibilities for processing permit applications and making permit decisions on those permit applications that do not require the preparation of an environmental impact statement.

11. ARM 17.8.762 Duration of Permit. An air quality permit shall be valid until revoked or modified, as provided in this subchapter, except that a permit issued

prior to construction of a new or altered source may contain a condition providing that the permit will expire unless construction is commenced within the time specified in the permit, which in no event may be less than 1 year after the permit is issued.

12. ARM 17.8.763 Revocation of Permit. An air quality permit may be revoked upon written request of the permittee, or for violations of any requirement of the Clean Air Act of Montana, rules adopted under the Clean Air Act of Montana, the Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA), rules adopted under the FCAA, or any applicable requirement contained in the Montana State Implementation Plan (SIP).

13. ARM 17.8.764 Administrative Amendment to Permit. An air quality permit may be amended for changes in any applicable rules and standards adopted by the Board of Environmental Review (Board) or changed conditions of operation at a source or stack that do not result in an increase of emissions as a result of those changed conditions. A source may not increase its emissions beyond those found in its permit unless the source applies for and receives another permit.

14. ARM 17.8.765 Transfer of Permit. (1) This rule states that an air quality permit may be transferred from one location to another if the Department receives a complete notice of Intent to Transfer, including a Transfer of Location notice and an affidavit of publication from a newspaper of general circulation in the area to be affected. (2) This rule states that an air quality permit may be transferred from one person to another if written notice of Intent to Transfer, including the names of the transferor and the transferee, is sent to the Department.

F. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 8 - Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality, including, but not limited to:

1. ARM 17.8.801 Definitions. This rule is a list of applicable definitions used in this subchapter.

2. ARM 17.8.818 Review of Major Stationary Sources and Major Modifications--Source Applicability and Exemptions. The requirements contained in ARM 17.8.819 through ARM 17.8.827 shall apply to any major stationary source and any major modification with respect to each pollutant subject to regulation under the FCAA that it would emit, except as this subchapter would otherwise allow.

This facility is not a major stationary source since it is not a listed source and the facility's potential to emit is less than 250 tons per year (excluding fugitive emissions) of any air pollutant.

G. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 12 - Operating Permit Program Applicability, including, but not limited to:

1. ARM 17.8.1201 Definitions. (23) Major Source under Section 7412 of the FCAA is defined as any stationary source having:

a. Potential to Emit (PTE) > 100 tons/year of any pollutant;

b. PTE > 10 tons/year of any one Hazardous Air Pollutant (HAP), PTE > 25 tons/year of a combination of all HAPs, or a lesser quantity as the Department may establish by rule; or

c. PTE > 70 tons/year of PM_{10} in a serious PM_{10} nonattainment area.

2. ARM 17.8.1204 Air Quality Operating Permit Program Applicability. (1) Title V of the FCAA Amendments of 1990 requires that all sources, as defined in ARM 17.8.1204(1), obtain a Title V Operating Permit. In reviewing and issuing Air Quality Permit #3248-00 for the Goose Bay facility, the following conclusions were made:

   a. The facility's permitted PTE is less than 100 tons/year for any pollutant.

   b. The facility's PTE is less than 10 tons/year of any one HAP and less than 25 tons/year of all HAPs.

   c. This source is not located in a serious PM_{10} nonattainment area.

   d. This facility is not subject to any current NESHAP standards.

   e. This facility is not subject to current NSPS standards (40 CFR 60, Subpart A and Subpart OOO).

   f. This source is not a Title IV affected source nor a solid waste combustion unit.

   g. This source is not an EPA designated Title V source.

   Goose Bay's Permit #3248-00 includes federally enforceable limits that allow the facility to stay below the Title V Operating Permit threshold. Therefore, the facility is not required to obtain a Title V Operating Permit.

   h. The Department may exempt a source from the requirement to obtain an air quality operating permit by establishing federally enforceable limitations that limit the source's potential to emit.

      i. In applying for an exemption under this section, the owner or operator of the source shall certify to the Department that the source's potential to emit... does not require the source to obtain an air quality operating permit.

      ii. Any source that obtains a federally enforceable limit on potential to emit shall annually certify that its actual emissions are less than those that would require the source to obtain an air quality operating permit.

   The Department has determined that the annual reporting requirements contained in the permit are sufficient to satisfy this requirement.

3. ARM 17.8.1207 Certification of Truth Accuracy and Completeness. The compliance certification submittal required by ARM 17.8.1204(3) should contain certification by a responsible official of truth, accuracy, and completeness by a responsible official. This certification and any other certification required under this subchapter shall state that, based on information and belief formed after

reasonable inquiry, the statements and information in the document are true, accurate, and complete.

III. Emission Inventory

Source	Tons/Year PM	PM_{10}	NO_x	VOC	CO	SO_x
1986 Plains State 3-deck screen (up to 200 TPH)	13.80	6.57				
Material Transfer	13.97	6.75				
Pile Forming	11.04	5.26				
Bulk Loading	3.68	1.75				
Diesel Generator (up to 150 kW)	1.89	1.89	26.63	2.12	5.74	1.76
Gasoline Engine (up to 50 HP)	0.15	0.15	2.43	3.14	93.66	0.13
Haul Roads	2.74	1.23				
Total	47.27	23.60	29.06	5.26	99.40	1.89

- A complete emission inventory for Permit #3248-00 is on file with the Department.

IV. BACT Determination

A BACT determination is required for any new or modified source. Goose Bay shall install on the new or modified source the maximum air pollution control capability that is technologically practicable and economically feasible, except that BACT shall be used. The Department reviewed previous BACT Determinations for other recently permitted similar sources prior to making the following BACT determinations.

Goose Bay shall not cause to be discharged into the atmosphere from any non-NSPS affected equipment any visible emissions that exhibit an opacity of 20% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes. Goose Bay must also take reasonable precautions to limit the fugitive emissions of airborne particulate matter from haul roads, access roads, parking areas, and the general plant property. Goose Bay is required to use water spray bars and water and/or chemical dust suppressant, as necessary, to maintain compliance with the opacity and reasonable precaution limitations. The Department determined that using water spray bars and water and/or chemical dust suppressant to maintain compliance with the opacity requirements and reasonable precaution limitations constitutes BACT for these sources.

Because of the amount of NO_x, CO, VOC, and SO_x emissions produced by the diesel generator and gasoline engine, add-on controls would be cost prohibitive. Thus, the Department determined that no additional control would constitute BACT for the diesel generator and gasoline engine. The control options selected have controls and control costs similar to other recently permitted similar sources and are capable of achieving the appropriate emissions standards.

V. Existing Air Quality

Permit #3248-00 is issued for the operation of a portable screening plant to be originally located in the SW¼ of the SE¼ of Section 3, Township 31 North, Range 19 West, in Flathead County, Montana. This proposed site is designated as either attainment or unclassified for all National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Additionally, because the facility is a small and portable source that proposes to operate in attainment or unclassified areas on an intermittent and temporary basis, the Department believes that any effects upon existing air quality in these areas of operation will be minor and short-lived.

VI. Ambient Air Quality Impact Analysis

Permit #3248-00 will cover the operation while operating at any location within Montana, excluding those counties that have a Department approved permitting program or those locations in or within 10 km of certain PM_{10} nonattainment areas. In the view of the Department, the amount of controlled emissions generated by this facility will not exceed any set ambient standard. In addition, this source is portable and any air quality impacts will be minor and short-lived.

VII. Taking or Damaging Implication Analysis

As required by 2-10-101 through 105, MCA, the Department conducted a private property taking and damaging assessment and determined there are no taking or damaging implications.

VIII. Environmental Assessment

An environmental assessment, required by the Montana Environmental Policy Act, was completed for this project. A copy is attached.

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
Permitting and Compliance Division
Air and Waste Management Bureau
1520 East Sixth Avenue
P.O. Box 200901
Helena, Montana 59620-0901
(406) 444-3490

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)

Issued For: Goose Bay Equipment, Inc.
1995 Third Ave. East
Kalispell, Montana 59901

Permit Number: #3248-00

Preliminary Determination Issued: April 16, 2003
Department Decision Issued: May 2, 2003
Permit Final: May 20, 2003

1. *Legal Description of Site*: Goose Bay submitted an application to operate a portable screening plant in the SW¼ of the SE¼ of Section 3, Township 31 North, Range 19 West, in Flathead County, Montana (Jandron pit). Permit #3248-00 would apply while operating at any location in Montana, except within those areas having a Department approved permitting program. *A Missoula County air quality permit would be required for locations within Missoula County, Montana.* An addendum to this air quality permit will be required if Goose Bay intends to locate in or within 10 kilometers (km) of certain PM_{10} (particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 microns or less) nonattainment areas.

2. *Description of Project*: The permit application proposes the construction and operation of a portable screening plant that would consist of a portable 1986 Plains State 3-deck screen (maximum capacity up to 200 tons per hour (TPH)), a diesel generator (up to 150 kilowatts (kW)), a gasoline engine (up to 50 horsepower (HP)), and associated equipment. For a typical operational setup, unprocessed materials are loaded into a hopper and conveyed to the screening plant by a feed conveyor. The materials are then screened and conveyed to stockpile for use in various construction operations.

3. *Objectives of Project*: Goose Bay, in an effort to produce business and revenue for the company by the sale and use of the aggregate, submitted a complete permit application for the screening plant. The issuance of Permit #3248-00 would allow Goose Bay to operate the screening equipment at various locations throughout Montana, including the proposed initial site location.

4. *Additional Project Site Information*: In many cases, this screening operation may move to a general site location or open cut pit, which has been previously permitted through IEMB. If this were the case, a more extensive EA would have been conducted and would be found in the Mined Land Reclamation Permit for that specific site.

5. *Alternatives Considered*: In addition to the proposed action, the Department considered the "no-action" alternative. The "no-action" alternative would deny issuance of the air quality preconstruction permit to the proposed facility. However, the Department does not consider the "no-action" alternative to be appropriate because Goose Bay demonstrated compliance with all applicable rules and regulations as required for permit issuance. Therefore, the "no-action" alternative was eliminated from further consideration.

6. *A Listing of Mitigation, Stipulations, and Other Controls*: A listing of the enforceable permit conditions and a permit analysis, including a Best Available Control Technology (BACT) analysis, would be contained in Permit #3248-00.

7. *Regulatory Effects on Private Property Rights*: The Department considered alternatives to the conditions imposed in this permit as part of the permit development. The Department determined that the permit conditions would be reasonably necessary to ensure compliance with applicable requirements and demonstrate compliance with those requirements and would not unduly restrict private property rights.

8. *The following table summarizes the potential physical and biological effects of the proposed project on the human environment. The "no action alternative" was discussed previously.*

		Major	Moderate	Minor	None	Unknown	Comments Included
A.	Terrestrial and Aquatic Life and Habitats			X			yes
B.	Water Quality, Quantity, and Distribution			X			yes
C.	Geology and Soil Quality, Stability, and Moisture			X			yes
D.	Vegetation Cover, Quantity, and Quality			X			yes
E.	Aesthetics			X			yes
F.	Air Quality			X			yes
G.	Unique Endangered, Fragile, or Limited Environmental Resource			X			yes
H.	Demands on Environmental Resource of Water, Air, and Energy			X			yes
I	Historical and Archaeological Sites				X		yes
J.	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts			X			yes

Summary of Comments on Potential Physical and Biological Effects: The following comments have been prepared by the Department.

A. Terrestrial and Aquatic Life and Habitats

Terrestrials would use the same area as the screening operations. The screening operations would be considered a minor source of emissions, by industrial standards, with intermittent and seasonal operations. Therefore, only minor effects on terrestrial life would be expected as a result of equipment operations or from pollutant deposition.

Impacts on aquatic life could result from water runoff and pollutant deposition, but such impacts would be minor as the facility would be a minor source of emissions, with seasonal and intermittent operations. Since good dispersion of air pollutants would occur in the proposed area of operation and only a minor amount of air emissions would be generated, only minor deposition would occur. At the initial site location, the nearest surface water resource is a stream, which is located approximately 1/5 mile to the northwest, with a small hill between the proposed operating site and the stream. Therefore, because the small amount of air emissions generated would correspond to an equally small amount of pollutant deposition to local water resources and, because the nearest water is located 1/5 mile away from the proposed operating site, any impacts to the terrestrial and aquatic life and habitats in the area would be minor.

B. Water Quality, Quantity, and Distribution

Water would be used for dust suppression on the surrounding roadways and areas of operation and for pollution control for equipment operations. However, water use would only cause a minor disturbance to the area since only relatively small amounts of water would be needed. Any impacts from this proposed project would be minor as a result of using water for dust suppression and equipment operations because only small amounts of water would be required and the project would be temporary and intermittent in nature.

Further, equipment operations would result in the emission of air pollutants, which would disperse to surrounding water resources. However, as previously stated, emissions from the facility would be relatively minor, intermittent, and short-lived; therefore, any impacts from pollutant deposition on area water resources would be minor.

C. Geology and Soil Quality, Stability, and Moisture

The soils in the proposed site locations would be impacted by the screening operations due to the construction and use of the screening facility. Minimal disturbance to soil would occur as a result of construction and use of the facility because the facility would be operating in an existing open-cut pit and pollutant deposition upon the surrounding soils would be minimal. Additionally, the property owner does not propose to reclaim the site to its initial state, but intends to use the bottom of the mined area for construction of a shop and parking lot. Also, considering the facility's relatively small size, portable and temporary nature, the sites historical usage, future reclamation plan, and good pollution dispersion for the area of operations, any impacts (upon geology and soil quality, stability, and moisture) from operating this facility would be minor.

D. Vegetation Cover, Quantity, and Quality

Because the facility would operate in an existing open-cut pit, would operate in an area where good pollutant dispersion would occur, would be a minor source of emissions, and operations would be temporary in nature, impacts from the emissions from the screening facility would be minor.

As described in Section 8.F of this EA, the impacts from the air emissions from this facility would be minor. As a result, the corresponding deposition of the air pollutants on the surrounding vegetation would be minor. Also, because the associated water resource and soil disturbance would be minimal, as a result of equipment construction and operation (as described in Sections 8.B and 8.C), corresponding vegetative impacts would be further minimized.

E. Aesthetics

The screening operations would be visible and would create additional noise in the area. Permit #3248-00 would include conditions to control emissions, including visible emissions, from the plant. Since the screening operations would have a minor amount of emissions, would be portable, would have seasonal and intermittent operations, and would locate within an existing industrial pit, any visual, noise, and general aesthetic impacts would be minor.

F. Air Quality

The air quality impacts from the screening operations would be minor because Permit #3248-00 would include conditions limiting the opacity from the plant, as well as requiring water spray bars and other means to control air pollution. Additionally, the facility is considered a minor source of air pollution by industrial standards and would be located in an area where good air pollutant dispersion would occur. Also, limitations would be placed upon the operation of the diesel generator and diesel engine that would limit the facilities potential to emit. Therefore, the air impacts would be minor.

The operations would be limited, by Permit #3248-00, to total emissions of 250 tons/year or less of any regulated pollutant from non-fugitive sources at the plant, in addition to any additional equipment operated at the site. Furthermore, the emissions from this facility would be subject to BACT (see Section IV of the permit analysis). For example, the plant would be required to use water to reduce emissions from equipment operations, storage piles, and haul roads. Also, the operation would have temporary and intermittent use, thereby further reducing potential air quality impacts from the facility. Therefore, air quality impacts would be minor.

G. Unique Endangered, Fragile, or Limited Environmental Resources

The Department, in an effort to assess any potential impacts to any unique endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resources in the initial proposed area of operation, contacted the Montana Natural Heritage Program (MNHP). Search results concluded there are three such environmental resources found within the defined area. These resources include the Lynx, Bull Trout, Brush Tipped Emerald, and the Velvetleaf Blueberry. Area, in this case, is defined by the township and range of the proposed site, with an additional one-mile buffer.

The proposed area of operation lies within the boundaries of a large contiguous area that has been identified as potential Lynx habitat. The proposed area of operations is an existing permitted gravel pit that is already utilized for such operations and is approximately ½ mile away from Highway 2 and ¼ mile away from Burlington Northern Railroad. Because the site is already used for industrial purposes and the area surrounding the site is near a heavily used traffic area, it is not likely that the lynx would frequent this area. Therefore, impacts to the Lynx would likely not occur, with any potential impacts being minor and typical, due to previous industrial use of the site.

The Bull Trout is also found within the defined area, but is located ½ mile away from the proposed operational site, within the Flathead River, which is some ½ away. The nearest tributary (feeder stream) is approximately 1/5 mile away from the proposed operational site location. Therefore, because of the distance from the nearest waterways and the topography between the river and the proposed operational site, the proposed operations would have, at most, minor effects on this species of concern.

Further, because the proposed site is an existing open cut pit that is lower in elevation than the typical location of the Velvetleaf Blueberry, the site would be sheltered by topography and vegetation in the area, and would be located approximately 1/10 of a mile away the Velvetleaf Blueberry habitat. Thus, any impacts would be minor. Additionally, the source is portable and temporary, so any potential impacts would be short-lived.

H. Demands on Environmental Resources of Water, Air, and Energy

Due to the size of the facility, the screening operations would require only small quantities of water, air, and energy for proper operation. Small quantities of water would be used for dust suppression and would control emissions being generated at the site. Energy requirements would also be small because the facility is a small by industrial standards and would be powered by a small diesel generator and gasoline engine, with seasonal and intermittent operations. In addition, impacts to air resources would be minor because the source is small by industrial standards, with intermittent and seasonal operations, and because air pollutants generated by the facility would be widely dispersed. Therefore, any impacts to water, air, and energy resources would be minor.

I. Historical and Archaeological Sites

The Department contacted the Montana Historical Society - State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO) in an effort to identify any historical and/or archaeological sites that may be present in the proposed area of construction/operation. Search results concluded that there are no previously recorded historical or archaeological resources of concern within the area proposed for initial operations. According to correspondence from the Montana State Historic Preservation Office, given the previous industrial disturbance in the area, there would be a low likelihood of adverse disturbance to any known archaeological or historic site. Therefore, no impacts upon historical or archaeological sites would be expected as a result of the proposed screening plant operations.

J. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

The screening operations would cause minor cumulative and secondary impacts to the physical and biological aspects of the human environment because the facility would have only seasonal and intermittent use and because the facility is considered a minor source of air pollutants by industrial standards. The facility would generate emissions of particulate matter (PM), particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 microns or less (PM_{10}), oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), volatile organic compounds (VOC), carbon monoxide (CO), and oxides of sulfur (SO_x). Noise would also be generated from the site. Emissions and noise would cause minimal disturbance because the site is an existing industrial pit, previously designated and used for operations, such as that proposed. Additionally, this facility, in combination with the other emissions from the site, would not be permitted to exceed 250 tons per year of non-fugitive emissions.

9. The following table summarizes the potential economic and social effects of the proposed project on the human environment. The "no action alternative" was discussed previously.

		Major	Moderate	Minor	None	Unknown	Comments Included
A.	Social Structures and Mores				X		yes
B.	Cultural Uniqueness and Diversity				X		yes
C.	Local and State Tax Base and Tax Revenue			X			yes
D	Agricultural or Industrial Production			X			yes
E.	Human Health			X			yes
F.	Access to and Quality of Recreational and Wilderness Activities			X			yes
G	Quantity and Distribution of Employment			X			yes
H.	Distribution of Population				X		yes
I.	Demands for Government Services			X			yes
J.	Industrial and Commercial Activity			X			yes
K.	Locally Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals			X			yes
L.	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts			X			yes

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON POTENTIAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL EFFECTS: The Department has prepared the following comments.

A. Social Structures and Mores

The screening operation would cause no disruption to the social structures and mores in the area because the source is a minor source of emissions and temporary in nature. Additionally, the equipment would be located in previously developed open-cut pit that has been designated and used for such purposes and located in an area removed from the general population. Further, the proposed facility would be a minor source of air pollution and would be required to operate under the conditions in Permit #3248-00. Thus, no native or traditional communities would be affected by the proposed project operations and no impacts upon social structures or mores would result.

B. Cultural Uniqueness and Diversity

The cultural uniqueness and diversity of the area would not be impacted by the proposed screening operations because the proposed site has been previously designated and used for such purposes and is separated from the general population. Additionally, the facility would be considered a portable/temporary source with seasonal and intermittent operations and the predominant use of the surrounding area would not change as a result of the proposed project.

C. Local and State Tax Base and Tax Revenue

The screening operations would have little, if any, impact on the local and state tax base and tax revenue because the facility would be a temporary source and small by industrial standards. The facility operations would require the use of only 2 existing Goose Bay employees. Thus, only minor impacts to the local and state tax base and tax revenue could be expected from the employees and facility production. Furthermore, the impacts to local tax base and tax revenue is expected to be minor because the source would be portable and the money generated for taxes would be widespread.

D. Agricultural or Industrial Production

The screening operations would have only a minor impact on local industrial production since the facility is small by industrial standards and would locate in a previously disturbed industrial area. No effects on agricultural land would result because the facility would initially operate in an existing open-cut pit, is a temporary source with minor amounts of emissions, and the area immediately surrounding the site is not being utilized for such purposes. Also, pollution control would be utilized on equipment operations and production limits would be established to protect the surrounding environment at the initial operating site or any other area of operation.

E. Human Health

Permit #3248-00 would incorporate conditions to ensure that the screening facility would be operated in compliance with all applicable air quality rules and standards. These rules and standards are designed to be protective of human health. As described in Section 8.F., the air emissions from this facility would be minimized by the use of water spray and other emission limits established in Permit #3248-00. Therefore, only minor impacts would be expected upon human health from the proposed screening facility.

F. Access to and Quality of Recreational and Wilderness Activities

The screening plant would be operated at an existing permitted open-cut pit, located approximately 8 miles northeast of the town of Columbia Falls and approximately 1/10 of a mile north of the nearest household. The facility would generally have a minor impact upon the access

to and quality of recreational and wilderness activities. For the initially proposed site, operations would not affect access to recreational and wilderness activities in the area because the site is private property that is already used for the mining of gravel. Thus, no changes to recreational and wilderness activities, or access to those activities, are expected from the operation of the screening facility. Additionally, noise impacts from the facility would be minimal because the facility would operate within the confines of an existing open cut pit. Also, the facility would be a temporary source, with minor amounts of emissions. Thus, any changes in the quality of recreational and wilderness activities created by operating the equipment at the site would be minor and intermittent.

G. Quantity and Distribution of Employment

The screening operation is a small and temporary source, which would have only minor affects on the quantity and distribution of employment in the area because Goose Bay would use only two existing employees for the project. Thus, because no new employees would be needed for such operations, any effect on the quantity and distribution of employment in the area would be minor and short-lived.

H. Distribution of Population

The screening operation is a relatively small plant by industrial standards and no new employees would be expected for the operation of the facility. Also, no individuals are expected to permanently relocate to the area as a result of operating the screening facility. Therefore, the screening operations would not impact the normal population distribution in the initial area of operation or any future operating site.

I. Demands of Government Services

Minor increases would be seen in traffic on existing roadways in the area while the screening operations are in progress. In addition, government services would be required for acquiring the appropriate permits from government agencies. Demands for government services would be minor.

J. Industrial and Commercial Activity

The screening operations would represent only a minor increase in the industrial activity in the given area because of the size of the operations (relatively small by industrial standards) and the portable and temporary nature of the facility. No additional industrial or commercial activity would be expected as a result of the proposed operation.

K. Locally Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals

Goose Bay would be allowed, by permit, to operate in areas designated by EPA as attainment or unclassified, including the initial site location (SW¼ of the SE¼ of Section 3, Township 31 North, Range 19 West, in Flathead County, Montana). Permit #3248-00 would contain limits, which would be protective of air quality and the ambient air quality standards while the facility is operating in these areas, as a locally adopted environmental plan or goal. Additionally, because the facility is a relatively small (by industrial standards) and portable source that will operate at multiple sites on an intermittent and temporary basis, the Department believes that any impacts to existing air quality in these areas of operation will be minor and short-lived.

L. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

The screening operations would cause minor cumulative and secondary impacts to the social and economic resources of the human environment in the immediate area because the source is a portable, temporary source. Minor increases in traffic would have minor effects on local traffic in the immediate area, thus, having a direct effect on the social environment. Because the source is relatively small (by industrial standards) and temporary, only minor economic impacts to the local economy could be expected from the operation of the facility. Thus, only minor and temporary cumulative effects would result.

Recommendation: An EIS is not required.

If an EIS is not required, explain why the EA is an appropriate level of analysis: All potential effects resulting from construction and operation of the proposed facility are minor; therefore, an EIS is not required.

Other groups or agencies contacted or which may have overlapping jurisdiction: Department of Environmental Quality - Permitting and Compliance Division (Air and Waste Management Bureau and Industrial and Energy Minerals Bureau); Montana Natural Heritage Program; and the State Historic Preservation Office (Montana Historical Society).

Individuals or groups contributing to this EA: Department of Environmental Quality (Air and Waste Management Bureau and Industrial and Energy Minerals Bureau), Montana Natural Heritage Program, and State Historic Preservation Office (Montana Historical Society).

EA prepared by: Ron Lowney
Date: April 4, 2003